

# DRAFT

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)**

*DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE*

### **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

**RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

***March 13, 2002***

***Richland, Washington***

#### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Introduction.....	1
200 Area Change Package Draft Advice .....	1
DC Update .....	3
Top to Bottom Review.....	3
Institutional Controls (IC) Plan.....	4
C3T Groundwater Coordination Work.....	5
Site Visit.....	6
Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI).....	6
Committee Business.....	7
Handouts .....	7
Attendees.....	8

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

### **Introduction**

Pam Brown, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair convened the meeting. The committee voted to adopt meeting summaries from the January 28 joint meeting with the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) and the February 13 RAP meeting.

### **200 Area Change Package Draft Advice**

The committee looked at a third draft of the change package advice that was prepared earlier in the day with Susan Leckband, Pam Brown and other issue manager comments. Pam Brown, speaking in general about the change package, noted that the committee feels what they've seen is okay, but they had higher expectations for what happens next and what is included in the package.

Dan Simpson had circulated an earlier draft of the advice and received no comments.

Dirk Dunning pointed out that Doug Huston was preparing official comments by Oregon, taking him out of the loop. Pam Brown noted that Doug received a copy of the draft advice this morning and did not express any concerns.

## DRAFT

Dan Simpson suggested that the letter should highlight the positive steps the agencies have made toward working together. The letter might emphasize that the changes are encouraging and will certainly make things better. Dan also proposed that the advice endorse proposed changes and advise that the agencies work toward developing an integrated plan. Dan noted as well that the C3T will have input in this process.

Gordon Rogers raised questions about the comprehensive risk assessment and quantitative analysis mentioned in the first bullet of the letter: is this a reference to the vadose zone project? Since the change package dealt only with soil sites, will groundwater remediation milestones be tackled next? Gordon wants to ensure that remedial action characterization is not delayed in order to go back for analysis. He would like to suggest the agencies get on with what they've proposed, and once they have begun, they can dig into remediation milestones.

Dan Simpson clarified that this proposed letter does not intend to suggest the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) hold up what they're doing, but perhaps the language needs to be clarified. The committee worked on additional language for the second paragraph of the letter to eliminate any vestiges of "stop now" in the wording.

Bryan Foley, Department of Energy, Richland Office (DOE-RL), noted that the integration between groundwater and vadose zone work is already happening. He also explained that the scope was limited to non-tank farm operable units because those Tri Party Agreement (TPA) milestones had to be dealt with right away.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, acknowledged that EPA would rather have been implementing an integrated program from the beginning, looking at how every piece fits together. Dennis expects that by late May or early June, the baseline will be pulled together.

Susan Leckband reminded everyone that it was understood that the change package was limited. This letter simply serves as a reminder from the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) to the agencies about the need to integrate.

The following sentence was added to the second paragraph: "This letter does not recommend any delay to ongoing work or the implementation of the 200 Area Change Package, but encourages integration of necessary long-term clean up activities."

Dennis Faulk next mentioned that agency response to the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet would be "we will be doing these analyses over time." Susan Leckband asked why everyone thinks the assessments are not integrated if, in fact, they are. Dennis' response is that the agencies have not done a good job of clarifying what they do, and have not made a good case for the integration that is already in place. Pam suggested, then, that the response to the advice might be "it is integrated," with an explanation of how.

## **DRAFT**

Next, John Price, Ecology, noted that the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet is the key statement of the advice, and he suggested bringing it up to the front of the letter, including a reminder that the HAB was only asked to comment on non-tank integration.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet was rewritten as follows: “This change package only includes non-tank operable units. However, there is an extensive inventory of remediation needs that must be resolved on an integrated, consistent basis.”

Pam suggested, and Dennis agreed, that the final section of the advice is problematic. The closing paragraph will be rewritten as follows: change “must” to “should;” delete the last phrase “to be achieved...”.

Finally, Pam suggested that, rather than put it in the advice, the list of questions should be provided to DOE and the regulators to address in their April HAB presentation, if possible. If DOE’s response is not satisfactory, the unanswered concerns can be inserted into the advice. Dennis Faulk commented that this is a good piece to add to the risk assessment of the 200 Area. The committee made some changes to capture additional concerns, and the revised list will go out in the packet to the full board for the April meeting.

The facilitators will distribute an updated version of the advice based on these changes.

### **Washington DC Update**

Pam Brown was in Washington, D.C. recently and had an opportunity to talk to Jessie Roberson about the need for DOE-Headquarters (HQ) to reauthorize the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB’s). Apparently, Jessie didn’t know she needed to take action, but added that her intent was to renew.

Pam also attended a meeting of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, at which the Energy Secretary was asking for Hanford funding. People from around the country aren’t happy about Hanford getting money from the accelerated cleanup fund. Senators from all the other DOE sites want more details of what Hanford has proposed. Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, is working on getting the information out. Pam acknowledged that the Challenges and Constraints to Cleanup Team (C3T) is responsible for getting funding this far, as no other sites are engaged with the regulators like they are.

### **Top to Bottom Review**

While in DC, Pam Brown also had an opportunity to identify questions for the DOE-HQ staff about the Top to Bottom review. The review makes a point of risk based budgeting, emphasizing that risk needs to be the driving factor. Pam reported she observed that this approach has not worked in the past as a way to calculate risk, and she asked how it would be different now. DOE-HQ staff replied that they will ask agencies to prioritize locally.

## **DRAFT**

Susan Leckband wondered if the local people know that.

Pam reported that the DC staff also assured her that the reference to Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) in the review did not imply that ISMS was not working. Rather, they agreed it works in the field and it needs to be taken to the next level (getting management as well as the workforce on board).

Pam next raised the concern of the Environmental Management (EM) focus on Science & Technology (S&T). The Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG)'s funding is cut, and Pam pointed out that the STCG is the only mechanism for the HAB to know what is going on with S&T. Dennis suggested that perhaps a meeting with Paul Kruger, DOE-RL, is necessary to convey the importance of this issue.

In addition, the committee is concerned about continuing EM funding priorities for science and technology. The perception is that DOE looked at the investment in S&T, and thought there was no return on that investment. Dennis Faulk suggested that there is a need for the HAB to encourage DOE to continue to invest in these areas to ensure success, stressing that the program was just starting to get where it needed to go.

The committee decided to draft comments for the Budgets and Contracts Committee to include in its advice on the Top to Bottom Review regarding Science and Technology. The comments read:

“Some of the of major contaminated sites across the DOE complex require that new science and technology development and applications continue. The Top to Bottom Review limits the priority of science and technology funding to focus on closure sites and high risk/high cost alternatives, leaving out critical elements requiring funding for the complex-wide cleanup success. At Hanford, we are specifically concerned about the need for science and technology in the following areas: remote TRU retrieval and packaging; tank waste retrieval, soil remediation, groundwater, and others.”

“It is essential that EM recognizes its responsibility to support and ensure that EM science needs assigned to the DOE Office of Science are adequately funded.”

“The EM S&T program has recently made significant progress in achieving usable results with its customer-driven requests for field applications. This results-based model should continue and be adequately funded.”

### **Institutional Controls (IC) Plan**

Susan Leckband reported that the IC plan is just about ready for public comment. Susan does not think the plan contains anything controversial and doesn't warrant HAB advice. What will warrant advice is the Long-Term Stewardship (LTS) Plan that will come out later.

## **DRAFT**

Mike Goldstein, EPA, elaborated on elements of the IC plan: it is part of the administrative requirements to limit access to hazardous materials; it will begin to assess how those controls are being implemented and performed; and it will report on violations and problems. The plan also outlines how IC's will travel with land transfers. Mike emphasized that the plan is very much a living document; and it will be assessed and updated until cleanup is done.

Jim Curdy asked if a land transfer to US Fish and Wildlife (USFW) is part of this. Jim Daily, DOE-RL, replied that since the current vision is to shrink DOE's administrative footprint to the Central Plateau, there would be other parties involved in the management of the site. Jim Daily suggested it may be useful to get a real estate officer in to talk about how DOE excesses or leases property safely.

Susan Leckband asserted that it's clear that to affect something in the LTS plan, the committee must comment on the Records of Decision. Pam suggested the committee make sure that stewardship is provided for in the RODs.

Jim Daily commented further on the LTS plan. He mentioned that DOE wants to provide value with the plan, but it will be hard not to stumble over other efforts that may determine LTS at Hanford (such as C3T, the exits strategy committee, and HQ and the State and Tribal Government Working Group (STGWG) interactions on national policy). Jim is excited to get the plan out, since it tells that there's a safe future for Hanford. He is not sure the plan is mature enough yet to get through a review process, but it could be available in a couple of months.

### **C3T Groundwater Coordination Work**

Jane Hedges, Ecology, reported on the C3T work. Beginning last June, staff developed 42 targets of opportunity - places where they could do things better and cheaper while still accomplishing what they needed. Out of the 42, they then picked out the top group of issues, one of which is groundwater. Jane reiterated that C3T is not meant to be a negotiation; rather, the agencies are trying to work together to agree on what they can do more efficiently. Part of C3T's task is to bring problems to high-level management and have the senior level focus on issues. Each of the 7 teams developed a charter; for groundwater, the charter focused initially on looking at monitoring and assessing strategy. The team's goal is to minimize duplications, change inconsistencies, and deal with what the regulators have dictated. Jane noted that the C3T is on track for progress by June, and reminded the committee that the C3T work will feed into the overall Central Plateau plan.

John Morse, DOE-RL, added that C3T is setting up a process everyone buys into, and enabling agencies to focus decision-making on what information wells can provide for cleaning up groundwater.

Jane Hedges added that the next step is assessment to see where the contamination is moving and how, so agencies will know where to put new wells. They hope to have a

## **DRAFT**

process strategy by June to fulfill the goal of integrating groundwater remediation with other cleanup activities.

### **Committee Discussion**

Dan Simpson asked how it is possible the agencies do not have a good idea of what needs to be done. Jane Hedges replied that they have a lot of knowledge, but groundwater has changed and they don't want to invest money without it being useful.

Jim Curdy asked about historical records from the cities as a source of groundwater information. John Morse replied that DOE does use information from Richland. Debra McBaugh, Department of Health (DOH), added that DOH does measurements from the Richland pump house and also occasionally measures near Pasco.

Pam asked Jane Hedges if the agencies have a way to merge Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) regulations. Jane prefers "coordinate" to "merge", since not every well can meet every law. The agencies acknowledge that they can do a better job of coordinating the regulations. Dennis Faulk added that the agencies should be able to clearly articulate what they're doing with groundwater when this process is done.

### **Site Visit**

Pam will request tours to coincide with April Committee Week. Ideally, the tour would visit the following areas: F Fuel Basin, K Basins, Cold Vacuum Drying Facility (CVDF), Canister Storage Building (CSB), Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), U Plant (if the viewing bubble is still in there), a reactor (H or other), the Central Waste Complex trenches, and the Waste Receiving and Processing (WRAP) plant. Everyone present at the meeting indicated they want to go on the tour.

### **Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI)**

Craig Cameron, EPA, gave an update on the CDI. The CDI covers all five former processing areas in the 200 Area. The U Plant is being looked at as a pilot project that will pave the way for dealing with the rest of the canyon buildings. The close-in-place, collapsed structure alternative has been selected as the preferred alternative, and will include adding approximately 1000 cubic meters of storage space. What contributed to this preferred alternative is the feeling that it would be better to maximize the space, and the shielding in the building, by putting in waste that needs remote handling or some kind of decontamination.

Rick Bond, Ecology, commented that the proposed cap system seems over-designed and prohibitively costly. Gary McFarlen, Bechtel Hanford Incorporated (BHI), responded that C3T will look at the cost issues and determine where savings may be found.

## **DRAFT**

Pam Brown asked if, like cocooning a reactor, a roof would have to be put on the building site. Craig Cameron replied that, no, there will have been enough decontamination, along with the fill material and the cap, to make the site safe. Rick Bond added that the project is designed to prevent long-term infiltration of water and is also designed so that if an earthquake occurs, waste would not instantly be released, and there would be time to fix a leakage problem.

Pam Brown asked about the time frame. Gary McFarlen replied that, since the project is waste driven, the sooner they could implement, the better.

Dan Simpson asked how many canyons are candidates. Craig Cameron replied all five, although they will have to look at the other four to decide what is best for them. The goal, however, is not to reinvent the wheel for each of those four canyons.

Dan Simpson asked if the canyon will be able to take HAW. Gary McFarlen is hoping that C3T will discuss that possibility. Currently, the plan is to take only category 3 waste and below.

Craig Cameron also mentioned that there is time before this building comes down to discuss flexibility in how much space to make available, as there are lots of streams that meet the criteria for storage in the canyon. Pam Brown asked about the cesium and strontium capsules; the proposal is to find something to put them in, and then find a place to store them for 200 years or so. Craig pointed out that it may be possible to store the capsules in the canyon on an interim basis, but it is illegal to dispose of them in the canyon permanently.

Pam announced that the communities have an excellent video on canyon disposition available for viewing.

### **Committee Business**

The committee canceled the conference call on March 19.

Gordon and Harold will be on the Executive Issues call on 3/21 to build the April HAB agenda.

### **Handouts**

February River and Plateau Committee meeting summary  
Advice #63, Institutional Controls, February 1997  
Draft Advice on 200 Area Change Package (Dan Simpson, et.al.)  
C3T Groundwater Strategy  
Groundwater Strategy Team Charter

## DRAFT

### Attendees

#### **HAB Members**

Pam Brown	Dave Johnson	Gordon Rogers
Jim Curdy	Susan Leckband	Dan Simpson
Norm Dyer	Todd Martin	Charles Weems
Jim Hagar	Debra McBaugh	
Harold Heacock	Maynard Plahuta	

#### **Others**

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique
Jim Daily, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Kristy Collins, Critique
Bryan Foley, DOE-RL	Fred Jamison, Ecology	George Cox, Fluor Hanford
John Morse, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL	Mike Goldstein, EPA	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Alex Teimouri, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Nancy B. Myers, BHI
		Gary McFarlen, BHI
		Allyn Boldt, Public
		Les Davenport, Public
		Jay McConnaughey, Yakama Nation